

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
WACO DIVISION**

INTELLECTUAL VENTURES I LLC )  
and )  
INTELLECTUAL VENTURES II LLC, ) C.A. No. 6:21-cv-01088-ADA  
Plaintiffs, )  
)  
v. ) **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**  
)  
GENERAL MOTORS COMPANY and, )  
GENERAL MOTORS LLC, )  
)  
Defendants. )

**DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SUR-  
REPLY IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO TRANSFER VENUE  
PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a)**

In this District, there is no right to file a surreply, and surreplies are “heavily disfavored.” *Warrior Energy Servs. Corp. v. ATP Titan M/V*, 551 F. App’x 749, 751 n.2 (5th Cir. 2014). Courts should therefore deny a request to file a surreply unless (1) the reply brief raises new arguments, and (2) the proposed surreply is necessary to respond to those new arguments. *Austin v. Kroger Texas, L.P.*, 864 F.3d 326, 336 (5th Cir. 2017). Here, neither of the two arguments cited by IV from GM’s Reply is new, and IV’s Motion For Leave to File Sur-Reply (Dkt. 48 “Motion”) should be denied.

*First*, GM explained in detail that its presence in this District is not related to the claims in this case in its opening brief. *E.g.*, Dkt. 34 at 1 (“the record demonstrates a demonstrable disconnect between the substance of this case and GM’s presence in the Western District of Texas”), at 3 (“None of the patented technology appears connected to the Western District of Texas.”), at 4 (noting the lack of connection between the Austin IT Center or its employees to the development of the accused technologies), at 5 (explaining the GM facilities in Texas listed in IV’s Complaint “have no bearing on this case”), at 11-12 (detailing why “GM’s ties to Texas are irrelevant” to IV’s claims). GM provided evidence in support of its arguments through sworn declarations. Dkt. 34-2 – Dkt. 34-5.

*Second*, GM explained in its opening brief and supporting declarations that a vast majority of witnesses possessing information about the design, development and implementation of the accused technologies—including GM employees and GM suppliers—are in EDMI. *E.g.*, Dkt. 34 at 4 (explaining a significant number of third parties who designed and developed the accused technologies are located in EDMI), at 9 (same); *id.* at 4 (identifying the GM personnel with knowledge of the design, development, and operation of the allegedly infringing hardware and software are located in EDMI), at 3 (same), at 10-12 (same); *id.* at 7 (“GM designs, develops, or implements the accused technologies in the Eastern District of Michigan”); *see also* Dkt. 34-2. GM’s opening brief also explained the

“documentary evidence relevant to the accused technology” is in EDMI with its Product Development Team and stored on Michigan-based servers, including “technical information and documents,” including “source code.” *Id.* at 7-8.

GM put forth its arguments and evidence showing Michigan is a clearly more convenient venue in its opening motion. Despite extensive discovery, IV was unable to contest that evidence and often simply ignored it. GM did not raise any new arguments in its Reply; a surreply is not an opportunity to back-fill what was missed in an opposition. IV’s request should be denied. *See Williams v. Aviall Servs. Inc.*, 76 F. App’x 534, 535 (5th Cir. 2003) (affirming denial of request to file surreply where “proposed surreply included no new arguments or evidence”).

Dated: June 28, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jeffrey D. Mills  
 Steven M. Zager (State Bar 2241500)  
 szager@kslaw.com  
 Jeffrey D. Mills (State Bar 24034203)  
 jmills@kslaw.com  
 KING & SPALDING LLP  
 500 West 2nd Street, Suite 1800  
 Austin, TX 78701  
 Phone: (512) 457-2040

Allison H. Altersohn (*Pro hac vice*)  
 KING & SPALDING LLP  
 1185 Avenue of the Americas, 34<sup>th</sup> Floor  
 New York, NY 10036  
 aaltersohn@kslaw.com  
 Phone: (212) 556-2316

Brent P. Ray (*Pro hac vice*)  
 KING & SPALDING LLP  
 110 N. Wacker Dr., Ste. 3800  
 Chicago, IL 60606  
 bray@kslaw.com  
 Phone: (312) 764-6925

Stephen E. Baskin (*Pro hac vice*)  
 KING & SPALDING LLP  
 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW

2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Washington, DC 20006  
sbaskin@kslaw.com  
Phone: (202) 737-0050

Angela Tarasi (*Pro hac vice*)  
KING & SPALDING LLP  
1401 Lawrence Street, Ste. 1900  
Denver, CO 80202  
atarasi@kslaw.com  
Phone: (720) 626-2300

*Attorneys for Defendants*  
*General Motors Company and*  
*General Motors LLC*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on June 28, 2022, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send a notice of electronic filing to all counsel of record who have consented to electronic notification.

/s/ Jeffrey D. Mills  
Jeffrey D. Mills